

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed February 3, 2005, in which Claims 1-14 are rejected and Claims 15-22 are withdrawn from consideration. Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the above amendments, are believed to render the claims at issue patentable.

Claims 1 and 5 are amended to particularly point out the features of the present application, and Claims 23-28 are newly added to particularly point out the features of the blades of the present application. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added and that the originally filed specification, drawings, and claims support the amendments.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

With respect to the Paragraphs 3-5 of the Office Action, Claims 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Otsuka (U.S. Patent 6,023,113), and Claims 1-7, 9-12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Horiuchi et al. (U.S. Patent 5,969,445).

In response thereto, Claims 1 and 5 are amended to particularly point out the features thereof.

Referring to Claim 1 and FIGs. 2-7 of the present application, the height of the extension portion of the shaft is approximately equal to the height of the extrusion of the fan hub.

However, the end portion 3 of the shaft 2 of shaft of Horiuchi is protruded from the hub portion 7 for securing the fan 4 at its upper end

(column 3, line 66-column 4, line 9, and FIGs. 1-2). Accordingly, the structures of the fan motor structure of the present application and the cited reference are different.

Referring to Claim 5 and FIG. 4 of the present application, the bearing assembly of the stator of the fan motor structure of the present application has one end protruding from the bottom surface of the fan base.

Neither Otsuka nor Horiuchi ever disclosed the bearing assembly of the stator has one end protruding from the bottom surface of the fan base. Referring to FIGs. 1-2 of Horiuchi, the bearings 17 does not protrude from the bottom surface of the fan base. In addition, the shaft 2 of Horiuchi protrudes from the bearing assembly 17 but the shaft 12 of the present application does not protrude from the bearing assembly 20. Referring to FIGs. 1-2 of Otsuka, the bearing assembly (2, 3) does not protrude from the bottom surface of the fan base. In addition, the shaft 5 of Otsuka protrudes from the bearing assembly (2, 3). Accordingly, the structures of the fan motor structure of the present application and the cited reference are different.

Referring to Claim 12 of the present application, a sleeve is embedded between the shaft and the fan hub to enhance the connection strength thereof. The sleeve is configured on the rotor.

However, Horiuchi discloses a bearing holder 15 that is mounted at a through hole 13 that passes through the center of the stator 12 by a bearing stopper 33 together with an oil-saturated felt 34 that is in contact with the bearings 16 and 17 (column 3, lines 36-42). The bearing holder 15 is configured on the stator 12, not the rotor. And the bearing holder 15 is as a part of the stator 12.

Neither Otsuka nor Horiuchi ever disclosed the sleeve which is

embedded between the shaft and the fan hub of the rotor. Accordingly, the fan motor structures of the present application and the cited references are different.

Accordingly, the fan motor structures of the present application and the cited references are different. Claims 1, 5, and 12 cannot be anticipated by Otsuka and Horiuchi.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 5, and 12 are allowable over the prior art of record. In addition, Claims 2-4, 6-11, and 13-14, depend on Claims 1, 5, and 12 respectively and add further limitations thereto, are also allowable over the cited references.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

With respect to the Paragraphs 6-10 of the Office Action, Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Horiuchi et al. in view of Snider (U.S. 4,471,250). Claim 8 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Horiuchi et al. in view of Fehrenbacher (U.S. 6,013,966). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Horiuchi et al. in view of Huang et al. (U.S. 6,509,666).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Since the fan motor structures of the present application and the cited references are different, and even in view of Snider, Fehrenbacher and Huang, Claims 1, 5, and 12 are not obvious. In addition, Claims 23-28 are newly added to particularly point out the features of the blades of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claims 1, 5, and 12 are allowable over the art of record. In addition, Claims 2-4, 6-11, and 13-14 and 23-28, depend on Claims 1, 5, and 12 respectively and add further limitations thereto, are also allowable over the cited


references. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) rejections of Claims 8 and 13 be withdrawn. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims as currently presented are in condition for allowance and hereby respectfully requests reconsideration. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience.

Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the art cited but not relied upon by the Examiner. Applicant has concluded that these references do not affect the patentability of the claims as currently presented.

Respectfully submitted,



Chao-Chang David Pai
Attorney (Reg. No. 51,195)
Pai Patent & Trademark Law Firm
1001 4th Avenue, Suite 3200
Seattle, WA 98154
(Tel) 206-372-3162